DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 252 269 JC 850 055

AUTHOR Wallin, Desna L.
TITLE Faculty Development Activities in the Illinois Community College System.
INSTITUTION Lincoln Land Community Coll., Springfield, Ill.
PUB DATE [82]
NOTE 25p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College Faculty; *Community Colleges; Evaluation Methods; *Faculty Development; Inservice Teacher Education; *Instructional Improvement; Program Effectiveness; *Program Evaluation; State Surveys; Two Year Colleges
IDENTIFIERS *Illinois

ABSTRACT

A study of faculty development activities in the community colleges in Illinois was conducted to determine what faculty development activities were being conducted; to determine whether orientation activities were felt to improve instruction; to compare the effectiveness of on-campus, inservice activities and off-campus, professional activities; to contrast the usefulness of group and individual activities; and to identify methods used to evaluate faculty development activities. Questionnaires were mailed to the chief academic officer at each of the 52 community colleges in the state. Study findings, based on a 75% response rate, included the following: (1) 94% of the colleges held an orientation activity for new contractual faculty, 89% provided orientation for part-time faculty, 100% conducted inservice activities, 92% provided some degree of funding for attendance at professional meetings, and 86% offered sabbatical leaves; (2) the majority of the respondents perceived orientation activities to be useful for the improvement of instruction, though orientation for part-time faculty was not perceived as positively as that for full-time faculty; (3) professional activities were perceived as being somewhat more useful than traditional inservice activities for the improvement of instruction; (4) with some qualifications, group activities were considered more useful than individual activities; and (5) evaluation efforts were found to be sporadic and somewhat unsophisticated. (LAL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED252269

FACULTY DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES IN THE ILLINOIS COMMUNITY COLLEGE SYSTEM

Desna L. Wallin

Educational Development Officer

Lincoln Land Community College

Springfield, Illinois 62708

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Desna Wallin

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

X Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

JC 850 055

ABSTRACT

In a time of declining material resources and restricted faculty mobility, faculty development has become increasingly important. This study addressed faculty development activities, their evaluation, and their perceived impact on the improvement of instruction in the community colleges of Illinois. Data gathered through the use of a questionnaire mailed to the chief academic officer of each of the state's 52 community colleges were analyzed and interpreted. It was found that a wide variety of activities--orientation, inservice, professional, individual, and group--are available to faculty members. Orientation activities were viewed as being moderately useful for the improvement of instruction. Respondents saw professional activities as somewhat more useful than inservice activities. With some qualifications, group activities were perceived as being more useful than individual activities. Evaluation efforts, for the most part, are as yet sporadic and unsophisticated.

The results of this study suggest that perhaps the traditional inservice-type activities may not be the "one best way" to deliver quality faculty development aimed at the improvement of instruction. Faculty development planners may want to examine more closely the needs of their faculty in relation to the activities available. In addition to continuing the most useful of the group and inservice activities, attention should be directed toward those individual and professional activities not frequently offered but rated as highly effective in improving instruction.

INTRODUCTION

Historical Context

Faculty development is a relatively new area of study and practice. As such, it has not yet developed a substantive research base. During the past decade, faculty development programs have proliferated as it became apparent that material resources were declining, that traditional student populations were eroding, that faculty mobility was decreasing, and that public sentiment for accountability was increasing.

In 1976, John Centra conducted a national study of staff/faculty development programs in the U.S. and discovered that over half of the 2600 institutions surveyed had some kind of formal program. Further indications of the importance of faculty development programs in higher education are the establishment of professional organizations such as the Professional and Organizational Development (POD) Network and the National Council of Staff, Program, and Organizational Development (NCSPOD). These organizations are conducting national and regional conferences, recruiting members, and actively supporting faculty development. Professional journals, too, are recognizing research and publishing articles dealing with various aspects of faculty development.

As faculty members experience an increasing sense of being placebound, they are resigned to spending more of their professional lives linked to a single institution. It is vital to the health of the institution to provide the resources to help faculty develop in a productive way and to resist professional stagnation. Because human resources need to be preserved, renewed, and cultivated, faculty development programs frequently become the vehicle for professional growth and renewal.

Faculty development programs which are directed toward the improvement of instruction have the potential for exerting a significant impact upon the entire system of higher education. Quality teaching has emerged as a professional imperative.

Problem

In the past decade faculty development has become increasingly important. In a time of declining material resources and restricted faculty mobility, faculty development emerges as a priority in the institutional planning process. Although faculty development is plagued with a multiplicity of definitions and goals, most institutions cite the improvement of instruction as a major program objective. There are, however, few systematic efforts to evaluate faculty development activities to see if they do indeed bring about improved instruction. At the present time, there is a general lack of information regarding faculty development activities and their effectiveness in the community colleges of Illinois. This study is designed to determine (1) the kinds of faculty development activities being offered in Illinois' community colleges, (2) the extent and sophistication of the evaluation of faculty development activities, and (3) the ways in which these activities are perceived as contributing to the improvement of instruction.

Rationale

A current picture of the types of activities being conducted, the perceived usefulness of these activities, and the evaluation procedures being used will bring about a better understanding of the relationship among faculty development activities, evaluation, and improvement of instruction. It could provide an initial data base for community colleges and others re-examining or initiating faculty development programs.

LITERATURE REVIEW

There is a growing body of professional literature in faculty development. Much of the available information, however, falls at two extremes--either too broad and theoretical to be applicable to individual institutions, or too parochial, anecdotal, and narrow to be useful. This literature review attempts to avoid the two extremes and present that which employs a sound theoretical base integrated

with specific working examples. Particularly, it will focus on activities intended to promote instructional improvement and the evaluation of those activities.

Activities

Eble (1972) reviews the necessary elements in a faculty development program which aims at improving teachers and teaching. Financial support, presence of a definite system, and lodging of responsibility with a high administrative officer are all prerequisites for a successful program. He maintains that there is a great need to establish adequate career development systems as part of regular institutional policies and practices. Faculty development should be an integral part of the institution.

Seven key recommendations for instituting or continuing quality faculty development programs in a time of retrenchment are presented by the Group for Human Development in Higher Education (1974). One of the suggestions particularly applicable to community colleges states that colleges and universities should organize regular campus programs on teaching, coordinated by an institute, supported out of the general budget, and sustained primarily by faculty themselves.

Bergquist and Phillips (1975) point out that any area of instruction being evaluated for improvement must be one in which training opportunities are available. Many faculty development activities are conceived with the purpose of helping faculty overcome perceived weaknesses. Short term workshops and seminars, individual development plans, and informal consultations all may contribute to meeting a particular need.

Zion and Sutton (1973), however, argue that precisely because "development" programs imply a deficiency of some sort, faculty are often reluctant to participate. A new orientation based on different assumptions is needed. "Development programs should have as their goal not the remedy of deficiency but the maximum growth and benefit of every member of the institution." (pp. 41-42).

Major approaches to inservice activities as presented by O'Banion (1974)

are as follows: (1) summer and year long institutes; (2) short term workshops; (3) staff retreats; (4) inhouse continuing seminars; (5) encounter groups; (6) conventions and professional meetings; (7) visitations; (8) packaged programs; (9) apprenticeships; and (10) professional reading. Writing four years later (1978) his list is modified somewhat. He maintained that the program of activities will depend upon institutional resources, expectations of participants, and the creativity of the staff development coordinator. Off-campus activities such as conferences, workshops, etc. should be used to benefit the college. The participants should bring home something of value for their colleagues. Other activities include retreats, graduate study, sabbaticals, a professional library, and faculty exchange programs.

In identifying faculty development activities at DeAnza College, Lucas (n.d.) divides activities into two categories. Individual activities include travel, leaves, conferences, exchanges, readings, visitations, and graduate study. Group activities include workshops, released time, seminars, visitations, retreats, and courses.

Toombs (1975) further suggests that faculty development "programs should be differentiated to incorporate the needs of faculty groups at various career stages" (p. 716). At minimum this will include new inexperienced, new experienced, and established experienced faculty. Many colleges attempt to deal with these various levels in their orientation sessions, holding meetings designed to meet the specific needs of a particular group. Toombs also argues for coherence and continuity in faculty development programs. "Insofar as possible, the program features should link into the ongoing or emerging activities of the institution. This helps to integrate innovation with improvement and evaluation with development" (p. 717).

Gaff (1975) describes the potential for change and for the improvement of instruction inherent in faculty development programs. "The kinds of change that

emanate from instructional improvement programs are more in the areas of process, teaching methodology, and techniques, learning materials, and interpersonal relationships. And the changes that do occur will probably have more impact directly on individuals and small groups than indirectly through changes in organizations as a whole" (p. 164). He summarizes the possible benefits to faculty members of participation in faculty development activities. A faculty member may acquire additional knowledge about teaching-learning issues, develop and use new or improved teaching skills, develop and use new techniques or methods of instruction, clarify attitudes and values about teaching-learning, derive greater satisfaction from working with students, and develop more stimulating and supportive relationships with colleagues.

Evaluation

Writing in 1978, O'Banion quotes from the AACJC's 1973 publication, New Staff for New Students to emphasize the magnitude of the institutional investment in faculty. "The staff of a college is its single greatest resource. In economic terms, the staff is the college's most significant and largest capital investment. In these terms alone we affirm that it is only good sense that the investment should be helped to appreciate in value and not be allowed to wear itself out or slide into obsolescence by inattention or neglect" (p. 27). Faculty development programs will be increasingly pressed in an era of tight budgets to "prove" their worth, to show that they really do bring about improvement of instruction. In order to do so, faculty development programs must develop a coherent and consistent framework for evaluating activities.

Bergquest and Phillips (1975, v. 2) discuss methods of evaluating faculty development activities. They maintain that program success can be identified in two ways: faculty growth and student learning. Cohen and Brawer (1972) further emphasize student learning as the sole indicator of successful teaching. "... student learning can be viewed as the ultimate criteria primarily because it

enhances the instructor's awareness of his own effects... Student gain as a criteria for measuring instructor effectiveness has had much support among educational researchers as well as among instructors and theoreticians" (p. 203). Where this view is held, a faculty development program may need to consider evaluating its activities in terms of student outcomes.

O'Banion (1978) takes the student development concept of evaluating activities one step further. He considers three levels of evaluation. The first includes such simple counting devices as participation and attendance. Direct feedback from participants on questionnaires is important. The second level attempts to discern changes in staff members as a result of the program. It is much more difficult to measure change than to tabulate counts. The third level of evaluation requires more sophistication than is presently available.

> There is general agreement that the purpose of staff development is to lead to improved student development. The thesis can be stated in this way: staff development leads to improved program development and organizational development which lead to improved student development... The difficulty of measurement in this construct is that there are too many variables between staff development and student development... As staff development continues to emerge as a new priority in the community college, however, educators will improve their skills. In the future they may be able to make links between improved staff development and improved student development (pp. 30-31).

Hammons, Wallace, and Watts (1978) address the difficult problem of evaluation of staff development activities. They define three levels of evaluation. Level A - Reaction - How do people like the activities? Level B - Learning - Does the activity effectively teach the concepts that it is supposed to teach? Level C - Behavior - Do the instructors apply what they have learned from the workshop in the classroom? Level D - Results - Is instruction improved? Are students learning more? The authors maintain that there are six questions which need to be asked at each level of evaluation. (1) What is there to know? (2) What can be measured to answer those questions? (3) What dimensions of learning

or performance are to be measured? (4) What are the sources of the measurement data? (5) How are the data to be gathered? (6) What evaluation criteria are to be applied to each question?

Kirkpatrick (1975) also looks at the question of evaluation of activities. Although intended originally for use in business and industry, certain aspects are appropriate for community college faculty development programs as well. His basic steps include: (1) reaction; (2) learning; (3) behavior; and (4) results. He maintains that in all these areas, the competent researcher can gather quantifiable data for various statistical analyses aimed at determining the impact of any particular activity on participating faculty members.

Chester Chase (1978) distinguised three types of evaluation measures: (1) Patronage measures include counts of how many persons availed themselves of the proffered activities. (2) Self reporting measures provide more qualitative data. (3) End-of-activity evaluations provide reportable information that can be circulated and publicized throughout the college.

Rhodes (1980) suggests three possible evaluative models. The first is the standard patronage measures approach. He entitles this the output model. "In this model the standards of achievement and success in staff development are focused on the activities performed and the efforts made" (p. 202). The second model he calls the outcomes model. "In this model the standards for achievement and success focused upon the effects or impact of the staff development program" (p. 202). The third model encompasses more than the program of activities and its impact. He calls this approach the instructional model. "It has a process orientation. In this approach, staff development is considered to be a form of continuing professional education" (p. 203).

From the review of the literature it becomes apparent that there are many perceptions of what constitute faculty development activities. Similarly,

there are widely differing views regarding evaluation procedures. However, most writers agree that impact - usefulness or effectiveness - of faculty development activities should be examined, and measured where possible, in some systematic way.

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

Definitions

Faculty development. The concept of staff/faculty development is ambiguous and vague when regarded in general rather than specific terms. At least six distinctly different activities fall under the rubric of staff/faculty development. (1) Staff development is aimed at classified and paraprofessional staff, including clerical, maintenance, and service personnel. (2) Administrative development is designed to fill the needs of administrators at various levels. (3) Organizational development comprises those programs which propose to alter the institutional climate in some positive way. (4) Instructional development addresses teaching methodologies and techniques. (5) Personal development includes activities often removed from professional concerns but designed to enrich the personal lives of participants, through sharing of interests in crafts, hobbies, travel, avocations, and leisure time activities. (6) Faculty development consists of those activities such as released time, sabbaticals, tuition credits, and professional travel support which are designed to help faculty develop themselves professionally.

Gaff (1975) condenses the various activities into three general categories. Instructional development consists of designing new courses, redesigning current courses, and updating instructional materials. Organizational development focuses on reorganizing the institution itself in order to create a better environment for teaching and research. Faculty development is the approach that

assists faculty members to develop their talents and teaching skills. Clearly, faculcy development suffers from a multiplicity of definitions and the lack of a well-developed conceptual base.

In this study only faculty development will be investigated. Administrative and support staff programs will not be considered. For the purposes of this study, faculty development is defined as any organized program, formal or informal, that attempts to assist faculty members in improving the quality of instruction.

Faculty development activities. Faculty development activities are separated into five categories for the purposes of examination of the data. Orientation activities are those large group introductory activities involving particular segments of the college community--new faculty, part-time faculty, continuing faculty.

On-campus inservice activities include special programs for full and/or part-time faculty, workshops and seminars, informal consultations, formal growth contracts, apprenticeships, and enrichment sessions. Both individual and group activities are involved. These are the types of activities that are traditionally associated with faculty development programs.

Professional activities are defined as those activities taking place off-campus, most frequently but not always, outside of an institutional setting. The off-campus professional activities surveyed included sabbatical leaves, summer institutes, faculty exchange programs, retreats, financial support for graduate study, funds for attendance at professional meetings, visits to other campuses, institutional grants and released time for developing instructional projects. Again, both individual and group activities are represented.

In order to distinguish between individual and group activities, the two types were drawn out of the inservice and professional categories and realigned

as individual and group activities. Individual activities included informal consultations, formal growth contracts, apprenticeship/model teacher programs, sabbatical leaves, faculty exchange programs, financial support for graduate study, funding for attendance at professional meetings, and institutional grants and released time for developing instructional projects. Group activities included special programs for full and part-time faculty, workshops and seminars, enrichment sessions, summer institutes, retreats, and group visits to other campuses.

Evaluation methods/devices. While the search of the literature revealed many ways of evaluating faculty development activities, most could be assigned to one of six major categories. (1) Verbal feedback is simply an account by a participant of his/her reaction to a particular activity. (2) Open-ended written statements ask for written responses to general questions about the activity. (3) Questionnaires use checklists or ranking of items relating to the activity. (4) The student outcomes approach uses improvement in students' performance in a particular area as an indicator of the success of the activity. (5) Classroom observations may be conducted by peers or by administrators in an effort to see if the information presented in an inservice activity is being put to use in the classroom. (6) Formal written reports detail the participant's reaction to a particular event or activity.

Improvement of instruction. Improvement of instruction assumes that all faculty members can better their instruction. In this study, improvement of instruction is not operationally defined. Thus, respondents may have differing views as to what constitutes improvement of instruction. Some respondents may see improved instruction resulting from direct instruction in pedagogy; for others it may be in keeping current with developments in the various disciplines; still others may see improvement of instruction through the re-thinking and re-

designing of courses and teaching materials. Any of these activities, as well as many others, may be perceived by the respondent as leading to the improvement of instruction.

Assumptions

The basic assumption underlying the concept of faculty development is that improving pedagogy, interpersonal skills, and creative opportunities for faculty will result in more dedicated, efficient, and competent instructors. Unfortunately, there is little evidence at this point either to support or reject the assertion that increased competency and effective teaching are outcomes of faculty development programs. O'Banion (1977) writes that "the assumption that staff development leads to better programs, more effective instruction, and improved organizational development--and thence to improved student development--is untested. Nevertheless, community colleges are providing increased resources for these programs" (p. 11).

In this study of faculty development activities in community colleges, there are several important assumptions. The first of these is the assumption that faculty members can and do change professionally. The second assumption is that the respondent is a person in authority who is knowledgeable regarding staff development activities. A third assumption is that development activities do vary in effectiveness. The final assumption is that the rating of the perceived usefulness of any particular activity is based on accurate observations of the activity.

Survey Questions

Five basic questions are addressed in the survey.

1. What are the faculty development activities being conducted in the community colleges of Illinois?

2. Are orientation activities perceived as being useful in improving instruction?

3. Are on-campus, inservice activities perceived as being more useful in improving instruction than off-campus, professional activities?

4. Are individual activities perceived as being more useful in improving instruction than group activities?

5. What methods and/or devices are being used to evaluate faculty development activities?

PROCEDURES

Methods

The descriptive survey method was used to determine the status of faculty development activities as they relate to the improvement of instruction in the community colleges of Illinois. A questionnaire was developed as the survey instrument . Some items were selected and modified from national and regional surveys. Others were formulated on the basis of the researcher's experience as the director of an educational development office.

Survey Instrument

The survey instrument consists of two major sections, "Activities" and "Use of Evaluations." Under the Activities section are three categories: Orientation Activities, Inservice Activities, and Professional Activities. The Use of Evaluations section asks the respondents to list ways in which the evaluations of faculty development activities are used. The survey attempted to determine the types of activities, the perceived usefulness of the activities as related to the improvement of instruction, and the extent and kind of evaluations being used. The survey utilized categorical, scaled, and fill-in response modes.

Sources of Data

The instrument and an explanatory cover letter were mailed to the chief academic officer of each of the 52 colleges in the Illinois Community College system. The chief academic officer was selected as the recipient of the mailing on the assumption that he/she would be knowledgeable about faculty development activities in the institution. In many cases, the chief academic officer forwarded the questionnaire to the appropriate educational development administrator, faculty member, or committee. Respondents were asked to return the survey within ten days. Those not responding during that time period received a follow-up telephone reminder.

FINDINGS

Return Rate

The survey was addressed to the chief academic officer of each of the 52 community colleges in Illinois. Responses were received in the first ten days from 30 (57%) participants. During the following week, another nine surveys were received for a total return of 39 instruments (75%). Three institutions reported "no program," leaving 36 survey instruments with data to be tabulated and analyzed.

Research Questions

1. What are the faculty development activities being conducted in the community colleges of Illinois?

Nearly all of the community colleges responding, 94%, held an orientation activity for new contractual faculty members. Orientation for new part-time

faculty members was conducted by 89% of the responding institutions. Inservice activities were conducted by all responding institutions. Single session workshops were most frequently cited (89%), followed closely by multi-session workshops and seminars (75%) and all-day programs for full-time faculty (75%). All responding institutions provided opportunities for professional activities as well. Some degree of funding for attendance at professional meetings was provided by 92% of the responding institutions. Sabbatical leaves were provided by 86% of the colleges and visits to other campuses were conducted by 83% of the responding institutions.

2. Are orientation activities perceived as being useful for the improvement of instruction?

Orientation activities often serve a social and organizational function as well as an instructional function. Orientation activities were perceived by the majority of those responding to be useful activities for the improvement of instruction. The orientation activity most frequently conducted was for new contractual faculty. Of the 36 opinions, 78% considered orientation of new contractual faculty to be an excellent or good activity for the improvement of instruction, while 62% considered orientation activities for continuing faculty to be useful for the improvement of instruction. Orientation for part-time faculty, on the other hand, was not viewed as positively. New part-time faculty orientation activities were regarded positively by 55% and continuing part-time faculty orientation was rated as good or excellent by 59% of the respondents.

3. Are on-campus inservice activities perceived as being more useful in improv-

ing instruction than off-campus, professional activities?

Single session workshops were the most frequently conducted activity followed by all-day programs for full-time faculty and multi-session workshops and seminars. There was a general feeling that these activities were useful for improving instruction. A rating of good or excellent was given by 75% of those conducting single session workshops, by 78% of those holding all-day programs, and by 80% of those offering multi-session workshops.

Funding for attendance at professional meetings was the most frequently offered professional activity, followed by visits to other campuses and sabbatical leaves. Again there was a high level of perceived usefulness of these activities for the improvement of instruction. Both professional meetings and visits to other campuses recorded 83% who saw the activity as good or excellent, while 75% responded positively to sabbaticals.

An average of 13.3 respondents saw inservice activities as good or excellent for the improvement of instruction, while an average of 15.1 respondents viewed professional activities as good or excellent. It appears from this sample that professional activities are perceived as being somewhat more useful than traditional inservice activities for the improvement of instruction.

4. Are individual activities perceived as being more useful in improving instruction than group activities?

The most frequently cited individual activity was funding for attendance at professional meetings, of which 83% rated the activity as excellent or good. Sabbaticals and individual informal consultations ranked second and third in frequency. Both activities registered 73% of the respondents ranking the activity as good or excellent for the improvement of instruction.

The greatest number of group activities were single session workshops. However, only 75% of those responding rated the workshop approach as good or excellent for the improvement of instruction. All-day programs ranked second with a usefulness rating of 78%, while visits to other campuses ranked third, with 84% of those responding seeing it as excellent or good for the improvement of instruction.

An average of 13.4 respondents saw individual activities as good or excellent for the improvement of instruction, while 18.8 viewed group activities as excellent or good. Thus, it appears that in this sample, group activities are perceived as being more useful to the improvement of instruction than individual activities. However, it should be noted that many of the individual activities were offered by responding institutions relatively infrequently, but were rated highly. For example, institutional grants and released time to develop instructional projects had the highest usefulness rating of any activities - group or individual - at 89% and 84% respectively. Similarly, formal growth contracts and financial support for graduate study, while not often available, were both considered excellent or good for the improvement of instruction by 78% of the respondents.

5. What methods and/or devices are being used to evaluate faculty development activities?

Most of the institutions responding held some type of orientation activities. Of those evaluating orientation activities for new contractual faculty, 41% used verbal feedback and 28% used a questionnaire for evaluation of the activities. A similar pattern is reflected in the evaluation of orientation activities for

continuing contractual faculty, new part-time faculty, and continuing part-time faculty.

Inservice activities were offered in various forms by all responding institutions. Workshops were the most popular form of activity. Again, there was heavy dependency upon verbal feedback and questionnaire evaluative techniques. Only three respondents indicated the use of classroom observation to see if improved instruction were occurring as a result of faculty development activities. Testing of students as a measure of improvement of instruction was never used as an evaluative device.

Professional faculty development activities were offered, though not as frequently, by all responding institutions. Sabbaticals led the list. They were most frequently (54%) evaluated by formal written reports. Released time and institutional grants for developing instructional projects were next in frequency. These activities were also evaluated most often (48%, 56%) by formal written reports. Interestingly, institutional grants for instructional projects were the only activities which used testing of students (4%) and classroom observations (9%) as evaluation techniques. As with inservice activities, the strategy most commonly employed in evaluating professional activities was verbal feedback. Formal written reports were also frequently used.

SUMMARY

Faculty development programs directed toward the improvement of instruction may help determine the quality of higher education throughout the next decade. This study addressed faculty development activities, their evaluation, and their perceived impact on the improvement of instruction in the community colleges of

Illinois. Data gathered through the use of a questionnaire mailed to the state's 52 community colleges were analyzed and interpreted. It was shown that a wide variety of activities - orientation, inservice, professional, individual, and group - are available to community college faculty. Orientation activities were viewed as being moderately useful in the improvement of instruction. Respondents saw professional activities as somewhat more useful than inservice activities for the improvement of instruction. With some qualifications, group activities were perceived as being more useful than individual activities. Evaluation efforts are as yet sporadic and unsophisticated.

CONCLUSIONS

Because faculty development is a relatively new area of study, there is little reliable research upon which to build a faculty development program. During the past decade, faculty development efforts have largely been a collage of unrelated activities held together by an office, a director, or a committee. If faculty development programs are to serve faculty in a meaningful way, there must be more attention given to the development of systematic and coherent planning and evaluation processes.

The results of this study suggest that perhaps the traditional inservice-type activities may not be the "one best way" to deliver quality faculty development aimed at the improvement of instruction. Most faculty development programs utilize a workshop/seminar approach which is constructed in such general terms that it meets the real needs of few instructors. Instead, it may be necessary to consider offering more personalized, individualized services--more one-on-one discussions, more opportunities to use creativity and initiative in designing and developing courses, more attention to the reallocation of scarce funds to support advanced graduate study and faculty attendance at professional meetings.

Group and inservice-type activities do meet certain organizational and social needs which may contribute, directly or indirectly, to improved instruction. Faculty development planners may want to examine more closely the needs of their faculty in relation to the activities available. In addition to continuing the most useful of the group and inservice activities, attention should be directed toward those individual and professional activities not frequently offered but rated highly effective in improving instruction.

If faculty development is to be a viable force in a climate of dwindling resources, more attention needs to be directed to the processes by which activities are evaluated and the purposes for which those evaluations are used. The survey shows that a disproportionate number of institutions rely entirely or very heavily on verbal feedback and questionnaires as their sole sources of information for assessing activities, documenting the effectiveness of current programs, and planning for future activities. While it may not be possible (or wise) to judge faculty development activities by student learning as suggested by Cohen and Brawer or O'Banion, it should be possible to devise more imaginative evaluative techniques that go beyond the simple counting of participants and recording of reactions.

RESEARCH AGENDA

The study suggests several research areas that warrant investigation. Further study should be undertaken to determine significant relationships between the improvement of instruction and various types of faculty development activities. A modified version of the present study should be administered to randomly selected faculty members to test the accuracy of administrative perceptions. The present study should be expanded to other states with well-developed community college systems to determine if results would be replicated. Ongoing

research should be initiated to examine, modify and experiment with evaluation techniques designed to reach more discriminating assessments of faculty development activities and their relationship to the improvement of instruction. Finally, the diverse group of individuals who comprise the teaching faculty of the community colleges should be better understood in terms of their own goals and needs if faculty development programs are to be successful.

There is much research yet to be done in faculty development as established programs mature and new programs begin. Especially in the current conservative fiscal climate, it is important that educators demonstrate that what they do makes a difference. Well-planned faculty development programs can help faculty use their resources, talents, skills, and knowledge more effectively. Faculty development programs directed toward the improvement of instruction have the potential for exerting a significant impact on the quality of higher education throughout the 1980's and beyond.

References

Bergquist, W. H., Mathis, C., Case, C., Clark, T., & Buhl, L. Jack Lindquist (Ed.). Designing teaching improvement programs. Berkeley, Cal.: Pacific Soundings Press, 1978.

Bergquist, W. H., & Phillips, S. R. Components of an effective faculty development program. Journal of Higher Education. March/April, 1975, 46, 177-211.

Bergquist, W. H., & Phillips, S. R. G. H. Quel (Ed.). A handbook for faculty development. (Vol. 2). Washington, D. C.: Council for the Advancement of Small Colleges, 1977.

Centra, J. A. Faculty development practices in U. S. colleges & universities. Princeton, N. J.: Educational Testing Services, 1976.

Cohen, A. M. Toward a professional faculty. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1973.

Cohen, A.M., & Brawner, F. B. Confronting identity: The community college instructor. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1972.

Eble, K. E. Professors as teachers. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1972.

Gaff, J. G. Toward faculty renewal. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1975.

Group for Human Development in Higher Education. Faculty development in a time of retirement. New Rochelle, N. Y.: Change, 1974.

Hammons, J., Smith Wallace, T. H., & Watts, G. Staff development in the community college: A handbook. Los Angeles, 1978 (ERIC).

Kirkpatrick, D. L. (Comp.). Evaluating training programs. Madison, Wis.: American Society for Training and Development, Inc., 1975.

Lucas, J. The DeAnza College staff development program. Unpublished manuscript, n.d.

O'Banion, T. (Ed.). New directions for community colleges: Developing staff potential. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1977.

O'Banion, T. Organizing staff development programs that work. Washington, D. C.: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 1978.

O'Banion, T. Teachers for tomorrow. Tucson: University of Arizona, 1974.

Rhodes, D., & Hounsell, D. (Eds.). Staff development for the 1980's: International perspectives. Normal, Il.: Illinois State University Foundation, 1980.

Smith, A. National research project on the status of staff, program, and organizational development in community colleges. Paper presented at the national conference of the National Council for Staff, Program, and Organizational Development, Denver, October 1979.

Toombs, W. A three-dimensional view of faculty development. Journal of Higher Education. November/December, 1975, 46, 701-717.

ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges
8118 Math-Sciences Building
University of California
Los Angeles, California 90024

FEB 22 1985